

THE STATUS OF *HELICELLA* AND *POLITA*.

By Dr. HENRY A. PILSBRY.

Read 9th December, 1921.

IN the last number of these Proceedings the name *Helicella* Férussac was discussed by G. K. Gude and B. B. Woodward. They conclude that it should displace *Polita* or *Hyalinia* for the well-known Zonitid genus typified by *Helix cellaria*, Müller, and that it cannot be used for the Xerophilous Helices grouped under *Helicella* by some authors, among them the present writer in the Manual of Conchology, vol. ix.

At the time that classification of Helices was published (1894-5), we were working under the old rules of nomenclature. Type species of composite genera were often selected by the method of "elimination". Now, under the international rules, we accept the first subsequent designation of a genotype in such cases. This change in the rules does not, I believe, affect the case of *Helicella*.

Beck's list virtually restricted the group to Zonitid snails, and other authors had used it for one part or another of Férussac's assemblage; but Hartmann¹ was perhaps the first to expressly state that Férussac had included in *Helicella* many heterogeneous species, and to restrict it to the group commonly known as *Xerophila*. Herrmannsen² evidently endorsed this restriction, as he cited Hartmann's work, followed by "Typus: *H. ericetorum*, Müll.". This was the earliest type designation, so far as I can ascertain. According to Herrmannsen's table, p. 507 of his work, was issued May 25, 1847. Gray's selection of *H. cellaria* as type of *Helicella* was later, in November, 1847. *Helicella* should therefore remain attached to the xerophile group of Helices, and not replace *Polita*.

For the Zonitid group of *H. cellaria* I have preferred to use *Polita* rather than *Hyalinia*. The names were proposed in the same year, 1837, the relative dates unknown; but *Hyalinia* would be considered a homonym of *Hyalina* Schumacher, 1817; by most nomenclators.

In the case of *Petasina* versus *Euconulus* we must accept the change, hoping that it is the last for this genus.

Some other decisions of this important paper seem to me open to question, among them the substitution of *Xeroclivia* for *Trochula*³

¹ Erd- und Süswasser-Gastropoden der Schweiz, i, pp. 143-44, 1842.

² Indicis Generum Malacozoorum primordia, i, p. 507.

³ In the Manual of Conchology I raised the question whether *Trochula*, Schlüter, 1838, type *H. elegans*, Gmel., should be replaced by *Trochoidea*, Brown, III. Conch. Great Britain, 1827, monotype *Trochoidea terrestre*, Brown (= *H. elegans*, Gmel.). The identity of Captain Brown's genus rests upon his figures, which seem to me unmistakable, and in no way upon the identification of *Trochus terrestris*, Pennant, as Gude and Woodward seem to infer. I did not have the 1827 edition of Brown at the time I was concerned with the matter, nearly 30 years ago. If there is any reason for rejecting Brown's name, I would be interested to see it brought out.

and the use made of *Xerophila*¹; but discussion of these and other cases may be deferred for the present, as the object of this communication is to testify on behalf of *Helicella* and *Polita*.

[POSTSCRIPT received since the foregoing paper was read, revoking the acceptance of *Petasina* in lieu of *Euconulus* :—]

Gude and Woodward substitute *Petasina* Beck, 1847, for *Econulus* Reinh., naming *Helix fulva* Müll. as type of the former, because that species has been selected as type of *Petasia* Beck, 1837. They assume that Beck proposed *Petasina* as a substitute for *Petasia*, hence it should have the same type. This is pure inference, since Beck does not mention his former name. However plausible such an inference may be thought, it does not place the name on the same basis with one stated to be offered as a substitute. *Petasina* has to be viewed like any other newly proposed generic group, and its type determined in the same way. So far as I know, the first type selection was that of Gude, 1911, who selected *Helix edentula*, Drap. (Proc. Malac. Soc. London, ix, p. 362). This type will hold; it cannot now be ignored. It is therefore proposed to retain *Euconulus* for the group of *Helix fulva*.

¹ The type of *Xerophila*, according to Herrmannsen, March, 1849, is *Helix pisana*, Müll. The name had better be forgotten in the *Helicella* association, as I concluded on other grounds in 1895. *Xerophila* is prior to *Euparypha*.